ﻟﻲ

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,160	08/16/2001	Alexandre Kravtchenko	80168-0240	1489

32658	7590	02/16/2005

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER
CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/930,160	KRAVTCHENKO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K Cao	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 November 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-13, 15-18 and 20-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,3-13, 15-18 and 20-33</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-33 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5, 31,

32; cancelled claims 2, 14, 19 and added claim 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as

failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "wherein the business object is responsible for

the data validating", which was not described in the specification. Applicant cited in the

remarks/arguments of the amendment (page 8, line 2) that the subject matter was from the

original claim 14, and no new matter is added. However, examiner notes that the original claim

14 was "wherein the business object is responsible for validation of an operation performed in

the session", and the specification (section 0019, page 6) cites "In step 26, reading and validating

of the data is performed and errors are logged". To Examiner, the above step is carried out by the

utility, not the business object. Examiner will interprets the limitation according to the

specification for examination purposes.

        Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3-13, 15-18, and 20-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wess (U.S. 6,163,781) in view of Sprenger (U.S. 6,363,388).

6.   **As to claim 1**, Wess teaches

-   selecting a file on a local drive or by URL, wherein the file includes a name of an object

    (Network interface converts the format of data and commands ... textually-based data

    objects; col. 6, lines 16-29 and lines 53-57, col. 13, lines 3-10),

-   uploading the file including the name of the object to a server (data and command from

    the remote system 116 ... processing system 115; col. 6, lines 16-29 and Fig. 7),

-   storing data of the file in a storage of the utility (When a data object instance ... by the

    functional components 106 and 108; col. 7, lines 38-44),

-   performing asynchronous data processing (The comparator compares ... matching

    variable symbols; col. 8, lines 45-60 and converter 108 processes ... measured value

    relational table; col. 9, lines 50-57),

-   saving and returned a report to the user after the data processing is completed (returning

    the actual values ... in the remote computer system 116; col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 13),

- wherein the data processing is performed by reading and validating the data (col. 8, lines

   45-60),

- and invoking a code in the object (col. 6, lines 30-35).

7.   However, Wess does not teach starting a session, a business object (wherein the business

object do the real work such as performing tasks including adding, deleting or updating the data),

storing data in a database of the utility, downloading and saving a report after the data processing

is completed, periodically displaying status and wherein the business object is responsible for the

data validating. Wess teaches the utility includes database and multiple tables (col. 9, lines 55-

57). Sprenger teaches starting a session (col. 19, lines 58-63), a business object (col. 3, line 66 –

col. 4, line 2, col. 5, lines 1-9, col. 5, lines 52-53, col. 20, lines 423-65) wherein the business

object is responsible for the data validating (col. 14, lines 59-65), periodically displaying status

(col. 15, liens 25-26 and col. 28, lines 20-42) and user can request and download a report after

the data processing is completed (col. 7, lines 27-32).

8.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Wess and Sprenger because it provides a method to

manage data in the database using objects and can support a wide variety of hardware

configurations, and easily scale up to meet added demands from the users.

9.   **As to claim 3**, Wess does not teach the code includes doImport/Export. However, Wess

teaches import and export functionalities are provided in the system (col. 12, lines 16-32).

Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-50). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that software objects provide code and

interface so it can be utilized in the application.

10.   **As to claim 4**, Wess does not teach the doImport/Export is a command to perform an

operation. Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-50),

and objects include commands to perform operations (col. 7, lines 1-9). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teaching of Wess and Sprenger to include the doImport/Export command in the object that

carries out the import/export functionalities.

11.   **As to claim 5**, Wess does not teach the code includes an interface to support an export

generation. Sprenger teaches the code includes an interface to support an export generation (col.

5, lines 45-50 and col. 18, lines 44-45).

12.   **As to claim 6**, Wess as modified teaches the interface includes a code for throwing an

attribute set returned by the business object (col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 13).

13.   **As to claim 7**, Wess teaches the utility is designed to process the file on the remote server

(col. 6, lines 25-29).

14.   **As to claim 8**, Wess does not teach the business object is written in Java. Sprenger

teaches the business object is written in Java (col. 5, lines 52-56).

15.   **As to claim 9**, Wess does not teach the session is for import and export operations.

Sprenger teaches the session is for import and export operation (col. 5, lines 45-50).

16.   **As to claim 10**, Wess does not teach the starting of a session includes generating a

unique session ID. Sprenger teaches the starting of a session includes generating a unique session

ID (col. 14, lines 34-39 and col. 19, lines 35-45).

17.   **As to claim 11**, Wess teaches the database of the utility includes a plurality of tables (col.

9, lines 55-57).

18.   **As to claim 12**, Wess does not explicitly each the plurality of tables include a user name

and session ID storing table, a session status storing table, an initial session data storing table, a

result storing table, an error message storing table, and a session log storing table. Sprenger

teaches the plurality of tables include a user name and session ID storing table, a session status

storing table, an initial session data storing table, a result storing table, an error message storing

table, and a session log storing table (col. 4, lines 30-39, col. 14, lines 34-39, col. 14, lines 59-65,

col. 17, lines 53-67, col. 18, lines 30-38, and col. 18, line 65 – col. 19, line 4).

19.   **As to claim 13**, Wess does not teach the business object includes a code including a

command that provides instance of the business object with an attribute. Sprenger teaches the

business object includes a code including a command which provides instance of the business

object with an attribute (col. 15, lines 25-26).

20.   **As to claim 15**, Wess as modified does not teach the business object includes a

findByAttributes. Wess teaches the query/retrieve functionality based on the search criteria such

as column name of the table that provided by the file uploaded from the remote computer (col.

12, lines 16-32). Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-

50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art adding any type of

commands/functions to the object is just a choice of implementation.

21.   **As to claim 16**, Wess and Sprenger do not teach the findByAttributes supports object

references in the file. However, Wess teaches sub-query is supported (col. 12, lines 26-32), and

object reference is widely used in object and object-oriented programming language. It would

have been obvious object reference is utilized in the system of Wess as modified by Sprenger.

22.   **As to claim 17**, Wess as modified teaches the business object includes a code that

receives a list of validated object attributes and returns a unique object identifier (col. 9, line 50 –

col. 10, line 36).

23.   **As to claim 18**, Wess as modified teaches the business object includes a code for

notifying an end of the data processing (col. 17, lines 5-10).

24.   **As to claim 20**, Wess teaches the file uses a CSV (comma-separated values) format (col.

6, lines 25-28).

25.   **As to claim 21**, Wess teaches the file is a text file including command lines, header lines,

and data (col. 6, lines 25-28 and col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 37).

26.   **As to claim 22**, Wess does not teach the session is an export operation. Sprenger teaches

the session is an export operation (col. 5, lines 45-50).

27.   **As to claim 23**, Wess as modified teaches the business object exports all of its data or

part of the data (col. 12, lines 16-32).

28.   **As to claim 24**, Wess does not teach the business object calls an interface including a

plurality of codes. Sprenger teaches the business object calls an interface including a plurality of

codes (col. 7, lines 2-9).

29.   **As to claim 25**, Wess does not teach the plurality of codes include a first code including a

name of operation and a business object class name to be inserted into an output file. Sprenger

teaches the plurality of codes include a first code including a name of operation and a business

object class name to be inserted into an output file (col. 7, lines 2-9 and col. 29, lines 50-51).

30.   **As to claim 26**, Wess as modified does not teach the plurality of codes include

onReceiveExport. Wess teaches the query/retrieve functionality based on the search criteria such

as column name of the table that provided by the file uploaded from the remote computer (col.

12, lines 16-32). Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-

50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art adding any type of

commands/functions to the object is just a choice of implementation.

31.   **As to claim 27**, Wess as modified does not teach the onReceiveExport is a code for

throwing an attribute set returned by the business object. However, Sprenger teaches an object

for carry out the import/export functionality (col. 5, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious the

object provides a method to return the result set to the user after finish processing the function.

32.   **As to claim 28**, Wess teaches the utility is a deliverer of information (col. 12, lines 16-

32).

33.   **As to claim 29**, Wess does not teach the data is changed without changing the business

object. Sprenger teaches the data is changed without changing the business object (col. 16, lines

25-32).

34.   **As to claim 30**, Wess teaches the utility includes a monitoring function, an error handling

function, and reporting function (col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 13).

35.   **As to claim 31**, Wess teaches the utility receives information from another system (col.

6, lines 16-29). However, Wess does not teach load information to the business object. Sprenger

teaches the utility receive data and command from the users (col. 28, lines 20-28), and

processing the commands utilizing the objects (col. 4, lines 49-58 and col. 5, lines 40-50). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the objects in the system of Sprenger

must have access to the data from another system in order to carry out the processing request.

36.   **As to claim 32**, Wess does not teach the utility receives information from the business

object and stores information on another system. Sprenger teaches the utility receives

information from the business object and stores information on another system (col. 13, lines 11-

21).

As to claim 33, Wess teaches

-    providing a utility on a server for exporting and importing data to the network application

     (col. 1, lines 14-20 and processing system 115;col. 5, lines 56-67 and Fig. 1),

-    associating a database with the utility (col. 6, lines 38-43, col. 9, lines 55-57),

-    with the utility, receiving a selection of an import file, the import file comprising data in a

     text file and including a name of an object (col. 6, lines 1-5, lines 12-15, lines 25-29, lines

     53-60, col. 13, lines 3-10 and Fig. 7),

- with the utility, uploading the data and the object name from the selected import file (data

and command from the remote system 116 ... processing system 115; col. 6, lines 16-29

and Fig. 7), wherein the uploaded data is stored in the utility database (When a data

object instance ... by the functional components 106 and 108; col. 7, lines 38-44),

37.   However, Wess does not teach a business object (wherein the business object do the real

work such as performing tasks including adding, deleting or updating the data), operating the

utility to invoke the business object associated with the business object name including

delivering at least a portion of the uploaded data to the invoked business object, whereby the

business object performs an operation on the delivered data, and updating the data in the utility

database based on the performance of the operation by the invoked business object. Sprenger

teaches a business object (col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 2, col. 5, lines 1-9, col. 5, lines 52-53, col.

20, lines 423-65), operating the utility to invoke the business object including delivery at least a

portion of the data to the invoked business object (The second tier ... the objects; col. 3, line 66 –

col. 4, line 2 and The object tier ... stored in the database; col. 4, lines 49-58), whereby the

business object performs an operation of the data (col. 5, lines 1-15), and updating the data in the

utility database based on the performance of the operation by the invoked business object (A row

is inserted into Address 408 the first time a Customer row is added for a given address; col. 20,

lines 55-65 and col. 29, lines 3-11). Although Sprenger does not teach the data is uploaded data,

one of ordinary skill in the art could modify to utilizing the data from the uploaded data instead

from the database.

38.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Wess and Sprenger because it provides a method to

manage data in the database using objects and can support a wide variety of hardware

configurations, and easily scale up to meet added demands from the users.

Response to Arguments

39.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) the data object taught by Wess is

not the same as "business object" as defined by the Applicants (page 8, lines 21-25), (2) Wess

fails to teach selecting a file that has a business object name in the file, and (3) Wess fails to

teach the business object being responsible for validating the data in the selected file.

        Examiner respectfully traverses the above remarks:

        As to the point (1), it has been clarified in the rejection of claim 1 to show that Wess

teaches a data object that has associated processing commands, and Sprenger teaches the

business object.

        As to the point (2), Wess teaches the user can transmit and receive data from the

processing system 115 (col. 6, lines 1-5), and the data transmit is in the form of file (see Fig. 7),

wherein multiple object names are included (see Fig. 7). Therefore, the arguments are not

persuasive.

        As to the point (3), see 112 1st rejection above for examiner's position.

Conclusion

40.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

41.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Diem Cao

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100